TYPIFICATION AND IDENTITY OF ANDROPOGON SACCHAROIDES SWARTZ

VAR. POLYTRICHUS GRISEBACH

Kelly W. Allred
Tracy Herbarium, Department of Range Science, Texas
A&M University, College Station, Texas, 77843.

In 1879 Grisebach described Andropogon saccharoides Swartz var. polytrichus. His brief description states only, "leaves softly pilose throughout, convolute; nodes appressed sericeus," and no specimens are cited. This entity has apparently been mentioned only twice in the botanical literature; once in the original description and a second time by Hackel (1889) when he listed the name as a questionable synonym of A. saccharoides var. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1006/journal.org/10.10

In the course of a taxonomic investigation of the <u>Bothrio-chloa</u> (<u>Andropogon</u>) <u>saccharoides</u> complex, I had occasion to examine material of this variety from Grisebach's herbarium at Göttingen (GOET). The single sheet bears five plants, only one of which possesses an inflorescence.

The fertile specimen is neither an Andropogon nor a Bothriochloa. Its morphological features agree perfectly with specimens and the description of Sorhastrum nutans (L.) A. Gray subsp. pellitum (Hackel) Burkart.

A brief description of the specimen follows: Plant perennial, ca. 55 cm tall; nodes sparsely short-hirsute; sheathes subglabrous, continued upward at the collar into short sheath-auricles; leaf blades 8-11 cm long, 2 mm wide, convolute, sericeus-pilose on both surfaces, markedly pilose in the throat; panicle 7.5 cm long; spikelets in pairs of one sessile and one pedicelled, the pedicelled one actually lacking and represented by the pedicel only; sessile spikelets 5.2-5.6 mm long, scattered-pilose with tawny hairs on the back, only 6 spikelets remaining; awns 9-12 mm long, pedicels 2.5-4.3 mm long, terete, long ciliate.

The label reads:

FLORA ARGENTINA

470 Andropogon saccharoides Sw. var. polytrichus Gr.
[this in Grisebach's handwriting]
Bei las Ramadas (Håhle)
unweit San Miguel;
Sierra Arbola de Cordoba

14-III-1876

Leg. G. Hieronymus

The International Code of Botanical Nomenclature makes it clear that holotypes, syntypes, and lectotypes are all specimens that have been cited in the protologue (see Article 7 and Guide for the Determination of Types). Guédès (1978) argues that "indicating a type is mentioning in a published outlet that one specimen definitely singled out as such is deposited in some definite place." Indications of intent by an author of a name, such as annotations on herbarium sheets, are useful in choosing a type, but do not satisfy the requirements for formal typification. Since Grisebach cited no specimens (directly or indirectly) in his description, technically there can be no holotype, syntypes, isotypes, or lectotype for the name Andropogon saccharoides var polytrichus Grisebach. Therefore, a neotype must be choosen.

The specimen in question is selected as a neotype for these reasons: 1) The specimen was seen by Grisebach and he identified it as his var. polytrichus; 2) The specimen is from Grisebach's herbarium; and 3) All data from the specimen (both morphological features and label information) agree with the protologue.

The formal typification is as follows:

Andropogon saccharoides Swartz var. polytrichus Grisebach
Abh. Konigl. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen 24: 309. 1879.
Neotype: G. Hieronymus 470. 14 March 1876. (GOET).

Literature Cited

Grisebach, A. 1879. Symbolae ad floram Argentinam. Abh. Konigl. Ges. Wiss. Gottingen 24: 1-345.

Guédès, M. 1978. Did Linnaeus ever indicate a type? Taxon 27: 128-129.

Hackel, E. 1889. Andropogoneae. $\underline{\text{In}}$ DeCandolle and DeCandolle. Monographiae phaneroganarum prodromi. Paris.